

BAY-DELTA PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE WATERSHED SUBCOMMITTEE

Meeting Summary

Meeting Date/Location: Friday, April 19, 2002
10:00 AM to 3:00 PM
Jones & Stokes
2600 V Street
Sacramento, CA

Meeting Attendees: See Attachment A

Meeting Handouts: See Attachment B

Welcome and Introductions

Robert Meacher, Watershed Subcommittee Co-chair, began the meeting with a welcome and round of introductions of all meeting participants (see Attachment A).

Debrief of the 3/15/02 Los Angeles Road Show Meeting

Mr. Meacher stated that the March Road Show meeting in Los Angeles was extremely successful. There was much positive feedback received from participants. The City of Los Angeles, and San Diego and Orange Counties were among those present. The meeting provided excellent opportunities for information exchange, and participants appreciated the chance to communicate with Patrick Wright, Executive Director of CALFED.

John Lowrie (CALFED Watershed Program Manager) explained that there has been discussion about using the Watershed Subcommittee as a vehicle for providing greater outreach and information. The Los Angeles Road Show meeting was a tremendous success. An objective of the meeting was to invite organizations that had received CALFED Watershed Program funding to describe their projects and desired outcomes, and how those projects relate to the objectives of the Watershed Program and Bay-Delta system. The meeting included 5 outstanding presentations by grantees. Another Watershed Program objective for the meeting was to connect with new partners. The meeting provided an opportunity for representatives from northern and southern California to share and inform.

Sam Ziegler (U.S. EPA) described how the meeting addressed 2 key issues: (1) the benefits of upstate water conservation and (2) the need to provide and sustain long-term funding for watershed efforts. Ken Coulter (SWRCB) added that the meeting generated energetic,

enthusiastic, creative participation by local watershed groups. Mr. Lowrie stated that the next Road Show meeting will be a tour to Cache Creek on May 17. Martha Davis (Watershed Subcommittee Co-chair) will be present.

Setting Priorities and Developing Measures of Success for the BDPAC Watershed Subcommittee

John Lowrie provided an overview of the 2002 BDPAC Watershed Subcommittee Workplan. He indicated that this agenda item is a continuation of a discussion held 2 months ago at the February Subcommittee meeting. This brainstorming session was in response to the BDPAC's requirement that the Watershed Subcommittee identify priority activities for the next year and report back on whether goals and objectives have been achieved. The conversation from the February meeting was summarized in a handout that lists 7 Goals and 7 Measures for Success for 2002. The Draft Measures of Success listed on the handout were proposed by Watershed Program staff, and not generated during the February brainstorming session. Mr. Lowrie indicated that Goal and Measure #7, which relate to funding the Watershed Program, are considered the most important issues to address. The Watershed Program is therefore seeking input and ideas from the Subcommittee on this and all elements of the Workplan. The Workplan is summarized below:

Goals for 2002:

1. Advise and support implementation of the current annual grant program.
2. Adopt initial set of Program level performance measurements and begin tracking performance of program.
3. Conduct public outreach through the Watershed Subcommittee.
4. Implement key elements of the Watershed Program Memorandum of Understanding.
5. Work toward integration of purpose and effort with other CALFED Program elements and the Environmental Justice Subcommittee.
6. Develop an annual implementation plan, including priorities, key activities, milestones, and schedules. These will be linked to current fund availability, both source and amount.
7. Continue to address and develop funding strategies for the CALFED Watershed Program.

Measures of Success for the Year End:

1. Successful completion of current RFP process on schedule
 - package of projects funded meets criteria identified in "initial implementation strategy."
2. Initial set of Program level performance measures adopted for use by August 31, 2002.
3. Schedule and conduct 4 road show meetings of the Watershed Subcommittee
 - 100 new participants engaged through road show meetings.
4. Complete execution of MOU by all cooperating agencies and departments
 - Management team operational, day to day responsibilities carried out on schedule
 - Interagency Watershed Advisory Team (IWAT) actively involved in development of implementation plan
 - IWAT fully integrated with Watershed Subcommittee.
5. One joint meeting of Watershed, Drinking Water, Water Use Efficiency, and

Environmental Justice Subcommittees

- Draft a shared set of Program integration principles.
- 6. Implementation Plan developed and adopted by responsible agencies and Watershed Subcommittee by August 31, 2002.
- 7. Adequate funding for implementation of the Program in years 3 and 4 secured.

One participant asked how Subcommittee integration per Measure #5 will be achieved. Mr. Lowrie responded that there has been interest expressed among BDPAC Subcommittee chairpersons to integrate efforts. He stated that Watershed Program staff feels it is appropriate for the Watershed Program to provide a link for integration among CALFED Program elements. The Watershed is the right context for natural resource management activities, and the community is the appropriate forum. Mr. Lowrie suggested that he invite other program representatives to speak to the Watershed Subcommittee at a future meeting. Mr. Meacher commented that the new U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service director for California has stated that watershed management needs to evolve to a level where communities are considered not just stakeholders, but partners. A participant commented that the ERP is developing regional implementation plans at the same time the CALFED Bay-Delta Program as a whole is doing the same, and that this is an example of parallel tracking versus integrated tracking.

One participant asked whether Goal #5 includes integration with the ERP. Mr. Lowrie responded that the ERP is the most difficult element to integrate but that the measurement will be changed to reflect all program elements. Another participant suggested adding a goal that refers to continued consideration of watershed restoration policies. Mr. Lowrie asked how success would be measured if goals focus on policy development. Another participant suggested adding the goal of MOU implementation progress review to goal #4. One participant proposed adding a fourth bullet to Measure #4 that states: "Review progress by Watershed Subcommittee." Another participant suggested adding a goal that links the Watershed Subcommittee work to California Biodiversity Council efforts.

Eugenia Laychek (BDPAC) suggested that 2002 Workplan Goals and Measures 2, 6, and 7 (above) be submitted as recommendations to the BDPAC by the Watershed Subcommittee. The next BDPAC meeting is scheduled for June 26–27. It will focus on Delta, watershed, levees, environmental justice, and restoration issues.

Mr. Lowrie indicated that if participants are accepting of the Workplan in general, staff will move forward with it.

Dennis Bowker (CALFED Watershed Program) provided an overview of the companion handout summarizing draft Watershed Program performance indicators and measurements (see Attachment B). He explained that the indicators and measurements format is based on that required by the CALFED Science Program, which includes an indicator, metric for indicator, objective, desired outcome, and justification. The outcomes in the indicators and measurements summary have been written to reflect the outcomes of the CALFED Watershed Program Plan.

Mr. Lowrie stated that there are different timeframes that apply to different indicators and metrics; some require shorter timeframes than others. Some timeframes may actually be longer

than the Implementation Plan timeframe itself.

A participant asked whether social scientists are participating in measuring Program progress. Mr. Bowker answered that the Public Policy Institute of California and Great Valley Center will advise on methods for measurement. Other groups are welcome to assist.

Mr. Bowker invited participants to read through the summary and provide comments on how to improve it. Mr. Lowrie indicated staff would like these indicators and measures to be adopted by the end of August 2002. He stated that staff might have to commission work to complete the summary by this deadline, which will require funding. Therefore, he would like input so the summary can be reviewed and revised at the next Subcommittee meeting before being submitted to the BDPAC.

CALFED Watershed Program Budget Update

John Lowrie (CALFED Watershed Program) updated the Watershed Subcommittee on the status of the CALFED Watershed Program budget. He indicated that the State government is constitutionally required to reach agreement on the Watershed Program budget for the next fiscal year by July 1. There is a substantial budget deficit anticipated. Mr. Lowrie presented a chart illustrating the distribution of funding for various CALFED Program elements, as proposed in the Governor's 2002–2003 budget proposal. The distribution of Watershed Program funding proposed is as follows:

- \$20.6 million of Proposition 40 funds (Clean Beaches, Watershed Restoration, and Water Quality);
- \$10 million of Proposition 13 Watershed Protection Account funds (administered by the State Water Resources Control Board Fund); and
- \$4.69 million of General Fund monies.

Mr. Lowrie indicated that most of the General Fund monies are likely to vanish. He noted that the Legislative Analyst's Office has proposed reducing current general fund levels by \$43.8 million and the total CALFED Program general fund request by \$12.9 million.

Robert Meacher (RCRC) stated that \$20 million out of \$300 million of Proposition 40 funds are going toward watershed work, and it seems that one-third of the \$300 million should be designated. He suggested that the Watershed Subcommittee participants encourage their respective representatives to support the Governor's budget as currently proposed. The Subcommittee members subsequently requested a list of the participants on the Assembly Subcommittee. Mr. Lowrie indicated that he would provide the Watershed Subcommittee the list of assembly members that he had been given while attending the Assembly Subcommittee meeting.

Ken Coulter (SWRCB) noted that the funding under discussion would be available for only 1 year. Mr. Lowrie responded that long-term funding could be available through Year 7 if the Water Bond initiative is placed and passed this November.

Sam Ziegler (U.S. EPA) stated that there is currently no funding identified to support staff for

grant programs. Mr. Lowrie responded that when the last budget for CALFED was appropriated at \$10 million, he believed it would establish the baseline for Program implementation funding. That funding has now been reduced to \$4.69 million total, with an additional reduction of \$3.8 million proposed.

Mr. Lowrie stated that no Proposition 13 funds may be used for Watershed Program staff and administration costs. Laurel Ames (California Watershed Network) noted that a percentage of Proposition 40 funds should be earmarked for administration of the Watershed Program. Mr. Ziegler responded that while it is not a specific requirement, the State legislature typically avoids the use of bond funds to support staff functions.

Mr. Lowrie stated that the good news is that \$35 million is available in the Governor's budget for implementation of Watershed Program projects. This amount is \$5 million less than the amount indicated in the Record of Decision but closer to the amount indicated in the ROD than has ever been appropriated.

Another participant asked what might be the spillover effects of the current funding situation. Mr. Lowrie answered that Watershed Program staff are trying to execute 54 contracts from the 2000–2001 PSP. He noted that Program staff is hopeful that the current budget problems will not affect that process. Mr. Lowrie also mentioned that SB 23 funds are available for expenditure during a limited time. Therefore, 1 year from now those funds must be completely spent or will revert to the General Fund. He is hopeful that those funds can instead be put into a revolving fund.

Mr. Lowrie reported that the first Senate Budget Subcommittee meeting was Thursday, April 18, and that he is waiting to hear the results of that meeting. The Senate Subcommittee was reported to be planning to support the Governor's proposed budget.

A participant commented that there is inadequate federal funding support for the Watershed Program budget, and that in light of cuts to State funds, federal funds will not meet the needs of CALFED staffing.

Another participant reported that Proposition 40 is scheduled to be signed and passed by July 1, which would provide funds for the next fiscal year. It is possible that Proposition 40 funds could be used for "softer" activities such as watershed coordination.

One participant suggested that the Subcommittee contact members of the Senate Budget Subcommittees to convey their thoughts on the budget. The current situation provides an opportunity to educate Senate members on the importance of watershed activities, and Watershed Subcommittee participants may prove to be effective educators.

Another participant suggested that the budget amounts, names, and contact information for Senate Budget Subcommittee be emailed to the Watershed Subcommittee listserv.

Interagency Watershed Advisory Team Update

Stefan Lorenzato and Mr. Ziegler serve as the State and federal co-chairs of the IWAT. The MOU provides for agencies to help with the Implementation Plan, local assistance, education and outreach, and Performance Measures.

Mr. Ziegler stated that the first IWAT meeting was held on March 20 and included representatives of several agencies. A framework was established and roles and responsibilities were defined at this meeting. The primary task of the IWAT is the Implementation Plan, and the IWAT will try to meet quarterly to address this challenge. Future meetings have been scheduled for June 12, 2002, November 13, 2002, and March 19, 2003. A goal of the IWAT is to strengthen its relationship with the Watershed Subcommittee. One suggestion has been to identify a subcommittee liaison who would regularly attend IWAT meetings.

The IWAT is developing a matrix to discuss areas of overlap and specifically where agencies are currently supporting watershed efforts. This matrix task includes developing a template for watershed program managers to fill out and submit. It also includes examining which programs support Watershed Program Plan goals, objectives, and outcomes and how these programs might be assisted to provide more support. Mr. Ziegler explained that the IWAT is attempting to develop a draft Implementation Plan to be approved by the Watershed Subcommittee. The IWAT is working to integrate this effort with the Performance Indicators and Measurements developed by Mr. Bowker.

Status of 2001–2002 Proposition 13 Request for Grant Concept Proposals

Mr. Lowrie reported that the CALFED Watershed Program is working with the SWRCB to review and process applications to 3 different funding sources. The concept phase, also employed by the Drinking Water Quality Program, is presently coming to a close. The 103 concept applications submitted, requesting a total of \$131 million, will be assessed to determine compatibility with Watershed Program goals. These proposals have been reviewed by the Selection Review Panel, and many have been promoted to the full proposal stage. Feedback letters and assistance workshops will assist applicants in developing and submitting full proposals.

Mr. Lowrie indicated that \$10 million is available for watershed work in small, disadvantaged communities, defined as a “divisible portion of a larger community, with a population of 10,000 or less, and with proof of economic hardship.” Interestingly, proposals from the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River watersheds dominate those submitted. Most of the \$10 million must be spent on capital outlay projects. He stated that \$1 million is available to support watershed planning efforts, while \$9 million must be spent on implementation projects. Conversely, more planning project proposals (32) than implementation project proposals (22) were promoted to the full proposal stage.

A participant asked whether the Watershed Program received many applications from pre-approved small communities. Mr. Lowrie answered that few proposals were submitted by local communities. More often, the Watershed Program received proposals from watershed groups representing small municipalities. Another participant asked whether there is coordination of

projects funded by different programs. Mr. Lowrie answered that there is formal coordination with the SWRCB but not with other programs. One participant asked whether future funding will be subject to the same restrictions as this year's funding. Mr. Lowrie responded that future funding conditions are unknown at this time.

Watershed Legislation

Watershed Education Day

Laurel Ames (Sierra Nevada Alliance) reported on the Watershed Education Day, held in Sacramento on April 11, 2002. The focus of the day was education rather than lobbying. The effort was communicated and promoted strictly through email, web, and fax (no hard copy communication). Many participants attended, and speakers from SWRCB, the Resources Agency, and RCRC gave presentations. Organizers received much encouragement to coordinate future Education Days. Mr. Meacher attended the Education Day and indicated that others stated they would ask their representatives to attend the function next year.

Water Bill Updates

- Water Bill 2070 is in suspension.
- Proponents of the Costa Bill have requested suspension in order to add language.
- The State legislature has plans to put the education and housing bills on the ballot. These bills involve greater funding than the water bonds. If the initiatives pass, passage of water bonds could become more difficult. The governor has indicated he will not sign any water bond initiatives.
- AB 2117 is complete. The bill recommends a strategic plan for State agencies. The report has been submitted to the legislature and has been distributed. It is available online at www.swrcb.ca.gov.
- AB 2806 has been revised at least 3 times. The Wayne-Dickerson bill is a work in progress. Renee Hoyos is working on this bill, which is due November 2002. Mr. Lowrie suggested it should be reviewed and critiqued by the Watershed Subcommittee. The bill involves State agencies partnering with local people to work on watershed management activities. It proposes a strategic plan to guide State agencies' future efforts to work on community watershed approaches.

Next BDPAC Watershed Subcommittee Meeting: Road Show in Cache Creek Watershed

Mr. Bowker provided an overview of the proposed agenda for the May 17 Road Show in the Cache Creek Watershed. The Watershed Subcommittee will meet at the Cache Creek Nature Preserve for the business portion of the meeting. Lunch will be served at the Cache Creek Casino. The group will then tour Capay Valley and return to the preserve, where representatives of projects funded by the Watershed Program last year will give presentations.

Jan Lowrey (Cache Creek Nature Preserve) indicated that the meeting site is a 45-minute drive from downtown Sacramento. The preserve, which is 130 acres, provides education to school groups. To help coordinate transportation, RSVPs will be requested for this meeting.

Watershed Updates

- Josh Bradt (Urban Creeks Council) stated that the Environmental Justice Coalition for Water is looking for a speaker for its workshops on May 17–18. Any suggestions are welcome.
- Josh Bradt proposed holding the fall Road Show Subcommittee meeting in San Francisco at Bayview–Hunters Point. Mr. Meacher responded that the BDPAC may have a meeting in San Francisco in December, and the June Road Show is planned for the Feather River Watershed.
- Mr. Lowrie indicated that the Watershed Program is planning to host the second Watershed Partnership Seminar this fall, and invites all alumni to suggest their supervisors attend. The Program will solicit nominations for participants soon.
- The Watershed Stewardship Plan for the Mokelumne River Watershed will be released at an open house on May 23 from 2 pm to 7 pm at Hutchins Street Square in Lodi.
- Mr. Bowker stated that he is working with the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) to identify closed stream gages that need reopening. Any recommendations are welcome.
- Mr. Ziegler indicated that the EPA administration has a new watershed initiative.

Mr. Meacher thanked the participants for attending and the meeting was adjourned.

Attachment A

MEETING PARTICIPANTS

Name	Affiliation
Ames, Laurel	California Watershed Network
Bradt, Josh	Urban Creeks Council
Bratcher, Tricia	California Department of Fish and Game
Brodie, John	San Joaquin County Resource Conservation District
Brown, Syd	Department of Parks and Recreation
Bowker, Dennis	CALFED Watershed Program/Sac River Watershed Program
Buzzard, Diane	Bureau of Reclamation
Cantrell, Scott	California Department of Fish and Game
Cornelius, James	Calaveras Water District
Coulter, Ken	State Water Resources Control Board
Crooks, Bill	City of Sacramento
Finney, Vern	Natural Resources Conservation Service
Freeman, Robin	Environmental Justice Water Coalition
Harris, Bob	Sacramento River Watershed Program
Haze, Steve	Millerton Area Watershed Coalition
Jacobs, Selene	Jones & Stokes
Lavelle, Jane	City and County of San Francisco
Laychek, Eugenia	BDPAC
Lorenzato, Stefan	California Department of Water Resources
Lowrey, Jan	Cache Creek Conservancy
Lowrie, John	CALFED Watershed Program
Matson, Tanya	Jones & Stokes
Meacher, Robert	RCRC/BDPAC
Miyamoto, Joe	East Bay Municipal Utility District
Oldland, Susan	California Department of Water Resources
Seits, Mark	TetraTech
Sime, Fraser	California Department of Water Resources
Smith, Lynda	Metropolitan Water District
Swearingen, Vieva	Cottonwood Creek Watershed Group
Taylor, Ernie	California Department of Water Resources
Thomas, Lenore	Bureau of Land Management
Voege, Hal	Consultant
Walsh Casey	California Department of Food and Agriculture
Ward, Kevin	ICE, UC Davis
Wermiel, Dan	CALFED
Ziegler, Sam	USEPA

Attachment B

MEETING MATERIALS

- Meeting Agenda
 - March 15, 2002, BDPAC Watershed Subcommittee Meeting Summary
 - Subcommittee for Watershed Management BDPAC 2002 Draft Workplan
 - CALFED Watershed Program DRAFT Performance Indicators and Measurement Summary
-